arXiv:0711.4851v1 [hep-th] 29 Nov 2007

MIT-CTP-3914

Violations of spacetime symmetries

Ralf Lehnert
Center for Theoretical Physics
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, MA 02139, U.S.A.

E-mail: `rlehnert@lns.mit.edu`

Abstract. The breakdown of spacetime symmetries has recently been identified as a promising imprint of fundamental physics, possibly arising at the Planck scale. This work gives an overview of various topics in this research area. The motivations for spacetime-symmetry investigations, including some mechanisms for Lorentz violation, are listed. The Standard-Model Extension (SME) for the description of the emerging low-energy effects is introduced, and some new theoretical results within this framework are discussed.

PACS numbers: 11.30.Cp, 11.30.Er, 12.60.-i

1. Introduction

Despite its phenomenological successes, the present framework for fundamental physics—the Standard Model of particle physics together with the General Theory of Relativity—leaves unanswered various conceptual questions. For this reason, a substantial amount of theoretical work is currently being devoted to the search for an underlying theory that provides a quantum description of gravity. Experimental tests of such ideas face, however, a considerable obstacle of practical nature: most quantum-gravity predictions in virtually every leading candidate model are expected to be extremely small due to the anticipated Planck-scale suppression. For instance, at presently attainable energies this Planck suppression translates into a required experimental sensitivity of at least one part in 10^{17}. This work discusses some ideas for addressing this issue with searches for spacetime-symmetry violations.

During the last two decades, a variety of theoretical investigations have suggested the possibility of spacetime-symmetry breakdown in leading candidate models for underlying physics. Examples of such investigations involve string field theory [1], realistic field theories on noncommutative spacetimes [2], cosmologically varying scalars [3], various quantum-gravity models [4], four-dimensional spacetimes with a nontrivial topology [5], random-dynamics models [6], multiverses [7], and brane-world scenarios [8]. Although the dynamical structures underlying the above models typically remain Lorentz symmetric, Lorentz and CPT violation can nevertheless occur in the ground state at low energies. These ideas provide a key motivation for Lorentz- and CPT-violation searches in the context of quantum gravity.

At energies that can currently be reached in experimental situations, the effects resulting from Lorentz and CPT violation in underlying physics are described by the Standard-Model Extension (SME), which is an effective-field-theory framework containing the usual Standard Model [9] and General Relativity [10] as limiting cases. A number of theoretical investigations and consistency studies have been performed within the context of the SME [11, 12, 13]. Some of these studies have illuminated various conceptual questions, but so far none have suggested any internal inconsistencies.

Its generality and consistency make the SME an excellent tool for the identification and analysis of experiments testing Lorentz and CPT symmetry, and numerous investigations along these lines have indeed been performed [14]. Specific studies include, for instance, ones with photons [15, 16], neutrinos [17], electrons [18], protons and neutrons [19], mesons [20], and muons [21]. These analyses have put tight bounds on a number of SME coefficients or combinations of them. Several of the obtained experimental constraints can be considered to test Planck-scale physics.

The outline of this work, which is based on a talk given at QTS-5, is as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of the philosophy behind the construction of the SME. A special limit of the electrodynamics sector of the SME—the Chern–Simons model—is briefly reviewed in Sec. 3. In Sec. 4, it is argued that for lightlike Lorentz violation, the Chern–Simons term can be removed on shell from the free model, and the idea behind the associated mapping is illustrated. Section 5 derives a compact expression for this field-redefinition mapping. A summary and a brief outlook are contained in Sec. 6.

2. The SME

To predict general low-energy effects of Lorentz- and CPT-symmetry breakdown that permit the identification of specific experimental signatures, a suitable test framework is needed. This test framework must allow for small departures from these spacetime symmetries. Various Lorentz tests are motivated and analyzed within purely kinematical models, such as Robertson's framework and its Mansouri–Sexl extension to arbitrary clock synchronizations, as well as the c^2 model and phenomenologically constructed modified dispersion relations. However, kinematical signatures of Lorentz breakdown constitute only a small subset of possible effects, so that the lack of dynamical features considerably restricts their scope. To address this issue, the SME, already mentioned in the introduction, has been developed over past decade. This section provides a brief review of the philosophy behind the construction of this test framework. This will give the reader an idea of the SME's generality and scope.

Let us focus on the flat-spacetime limit for simplicity. We just mention that a similar line of reasoning can be adopted in situations involving gravity. The starting point of the construction is the conventional Standard-Model Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SM}}$, to which Lorentz-violating modifications $\delta\mathcal{L}$ are added:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SME}} = \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SM}} + \delta\mathcal{L}\ . \qquad (1)$$

In the above expression, the SME Lagrangian is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{SME}}$. The correction term $\delta\mathcal{L}$ is assembled by contracting Standard-Model field operators of unrestricted dimensionality with Lorentz-breaking tensorial coefficients. These coefficients are assumed to be caused by underlying physics; they are interpreted as describing a nontrivial vacuum containing background vectors or tensors; they must be small on phenomenological grounds; and they are the quantities to be constrained by experiments. To guarantee coordinate independence, these contractions must transform as scalars under Lorentz coordinate changes. This construction makes it clear that all possible contributions to $\delta\mathcal{L}$ give the most general effective dynamical description of Lorentz violation at the level of observer-Lorentz-invariant unitary quantum field theory.

Potential features of Planck-scale physics, such as elementary particles with a non-pointlike structure or an underlying discrete spacetime, are unlikely to invalidate the above effective-field-theory approach at energies small compared to the quantum-gravity scale. On the contrary, the phenomenologically successful conventional Standard Model is widely regarded as an effective field theory describing the low-energy degrees of freedom resulting from more fundamental physics. If this underlying physics indeed leads to minuscule Lorentz-breaking effects, it would seem unnatural to consider a low-energy description outside the framework of effective field theory. Let us further note that the necessity for low-energy models beyond effective field theory is also unlikely to emerge in the context of candidate underlying models with novel Lorentz-*symmetric* features, such as new particles, additional symmetries, or more than four spacetime dimensions. Lorentz-invariant modifications can therefore be incorporated into the SME if needed [22].

The SME allows the identification and direct comparison of virtually all presently feasible experimental searches for Lorentz and CPT breakdown. Moreover, certain limits of the SME can be interpreted in terms of classical kinematics test models of relativity (such as the aforementioned Robertson's framework, its Mansouri-Sexl extension, or the c^2 model) [23]. Another benefit of the SME is the possibility of incorporating additional desirable features besides coordinate independence. For example, one can choose to require spacetime-translation symmetry, SU(3)×SU(2)×U(1) gauge invariance, power-counting renormalizability, hermiticity, and locality. Such features further restrict the parameter space for Lorentz breaking. One can also adopt simplifying assumption, such as a residual rotational symmetry in certain coordinate systems. This latter choice together with additional simplifications of the SME has been investigated in the literature [24].

3. Review: photons with a Chern–Simons term

A particularly popular limit of the SME is the Lorentz- and CPT-violating Chern–Simons extension of electrodynamics. This limit will be the focus of the subsequent discussion in this work, so we begin by reviewing various known results pertaining to Chern–Simons electrodynamics. Adopting natural units $c = \hbar = 1$, the free model Lagrangian is given by [25]

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm MCS} = -\frac{1}{4}F^2 + k_\mu A_\nu \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{2}$$

where $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu$ and $\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}F_{\rho\sigma}$, as usual. The nondynamical fixed k^μ selects a preferred direction in spacetime explicitly breaking Lorentz and CPT symmetry. Although this Lagrangian is gauge dependent, the corresponding action integral, and therefore the physics, are invariant under gauge transformations.

The Euler–Lagrange equations associated with the Lagrangian (2) yield the following equations of motion for the potentials $A^\mu = (A^0, \vec{A})$:

$$\left(\Box\eta^{\mu\nu} - \partial^\mu\partial^\nu - 2\,\varepsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}k_\rho\partial_\sigma\right)A_\nu = 0\,. \tag{3}$$

From Eq. (3), the Chern–Simons modified Maxwell equations

$$\partial_\mu F^{\mu\nu} + 2\,k_\mu\tilde{F}^{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{4}$$

can be derived, which put into evidence the gauge invariance of the model. For completeness, we also exhibit the modified Coulomb and Ampère laws, which are contained in Eq. (4):

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{E} - 2\vec{k}\cdot\vec{B} &= 0\,, \\ -\dot{\vec{E}} + \vec{\nabla}\times\vec{B} - 2k_0\vec{B} + 2\vec{k}\times\vec{E} &= 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The homogeneous Maxwell equations are left unchanged because the relationship between the fields and potentials is the conventional one.

Paralleling the ordinary Maxwell case, A^0 is nondynamical, and gauge symmetry eliminates another mode of A^μ, so that Eq. (3) contains only two independent degrees of freedom. It is often convenient to fix a gauge, and will actually do so in the next section. It turns out that any of the usual conditions on A^μ, such as Lorentz or Coulomb gauge, can be imposed. We remark, however, that there are some differences between conventional electrodynamics and the Chern–Simons model regarding the equivalence of certain gauge choices. A more detailed discussion of the degrees of freedom and the gauge-fixing process can be found in the second paper of Ref. [9].

The plane-wave dispersion relation can be obtained with the ansatz $A^\mu(x) = \varepsilon^\mu(\lambda)\exp(-i\lambda\cdot x)$, where $\lambda^\mu \equiv (\omega, \vec{\lambda})$. This ansatz and the equations of motion (3) give

$$\lambda^4 + 4\lambda^2 k^2 - 4(\lambda\cdot k)^2 = 0\,. \tag{6}$$

This equation determines the wave frequency ω as a function of the wave 3-vector $\vec{\lambda}$.

Examples of non-standard effects caused by the inclusion of the Chern–Simons term into electrodynamics are vacuum birefringence [25] and vacuum Cherenkov radiation [16]. We also mention that for a timelike k^μ, the magnitude of group velocity determined by the dispersion relation (6) can in certain circumstances exceed the light speed c. This is consistent with previous analyses [25, 26], which have established theoretical difficulties associated with instabilities and causality violations for $k^2 > 0$. Such issues do not arise for $k^2 \leq 0$. In what follows, we focus primarily on the case of a lightlike k^μ. We remark in passing that the lightlike case possesses more residual spacetime symmetries than the timelike and spacelike cases [13].

4. Basic idea

Our goal is to establish that a lightlike k^μ can be removed from the (free) equations of motions (3) by an on-shell field redefinition. This section discusses certain features of the solutions to Eq. (3) that give some intuition as to why k^μ is removable thereby motivating the form of the field redefinition.

For a lightlike k^μ, the dispersion relation (6) can be cast into the form

$$(\lambda^\mu + (-1)^a k^\mu)^2 = 0\,, \tag{7}$$

where $a = 1, 2$. This equation possesses the roots $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu = \Big((\lambda_a^\pm)^0(\vec{\lambda}), \vec{\lambda}\Big)$ with

$$(\lambda_a^\pm)^0(\vec{\lambda}) = \pm\Big|\,\vec{\lambda} \pm (-1)^a \vec{k}\,\Big| \mp (-1)^a k^0\ . \tag{8}$$

Here, $k^\mu = (k^0, \vec{k})$ is lightlike $|k^0| = |\vec{k}|$, and we have chosen a more convenient labeling of these solutions than that given in Eq. (7). The roots $(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu$ may alternatively be parametrized as

$$(\lambda_a^\pm)^\mu = p_\pm^\mu \mp (-1)^a k^\mu\ . \tag{9}$$

Here, $p^\mu_\pm \equiv (\pm|\vec{p}\,|, \vec{p}\,)$ satisfies the conventional photon dispersion relation $(p_\pm)^2 = 0$, where the subscripts + and − label the positive- and negative-frequency solutions, respectively. This result is immediately evident from Eq. (7) when the expression inside the outer parentheses is identified with the appropriate $p^\mu_\pm$.

The above reparametrization (9) is the key to an intuitive understanding of the field redefinition that removes k^μ from the equations of motion: up to polarization vectors, any plane-wave exponential that solves Eq. (3) is of the form

$$\exp(-i\lambda^\pm_a \cdot x) = \exp(-ip_\pm \cdot x)\exp(\pm(-1)^a ik\cdot x)\,. \tag{10}$$

Note $\exp(-ip_\pm \cdot x)$ corresponds to a Lorentz-symmetric massless plane wave; the Lorentz-violating contribution $\exp(\pm(-1)^a ik\cdot x)$ can be removed via a field redefinition

$$(\text{plane wave}) \;\rightarrow\; (\text{plane wave})\,\exp\left[\mp(-1)^a ik\cdot x\right]\,. \tag{11}$$

We remark that this field redefinition depends only on the plane-wave labels ± and a, but is independent of the plane-wave momentum. In other words, any superpositions of plane-wave exponentials with labels (+, $a = 1$) or (−, $a = 2$) can be redefined by removing the common $\exp(-ik\cdot x)$ factor, and superpositions of plane-wave exponentials with labels (+, $a = 2$) or (−, $a = 1$) can be redefined by removing the common $\exp(+ik\cdot x)$ factor.

To make this idea more explicit, consider the general explicit solution to the free equations of motions:

$$A^\mu(x) = \int \frac{d^3\vec{\lambda}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{a=1,2} \left[\epsilon^\mu_a(\vec{\lambda})\exp(-i\lambda^+_a\cdot x) + \epsilon^{\mu *}_a(\vec{\lambda})\exp(i\lambda^+_a\cdot x)\right]\,. \tag{12}$$

The polarization vectors $\epsilon^\mu_a(\vec{\lambda})$ are constrained by the equations of motion, the gauge choice, and—in cases of degeneracy—by the requirement of linear independence. We have absorbed the relativistic normalization factor of the integration measure into the definition of the $\epsilon^\mu_a(\vec{\lambda})$, so that they do not transform as 4-vectors. In what follows, we will nevertheless continue to refer to these quantities as polarization vectors. We also remark that the negative-frequency solutions are contained in the second term of this expansion because Eq. (8) implies $(\lambda^-_a)^\mu(\vec{\lambda}) = -(\lambda^+_a)^\mu(-\vec{\lambda})$. In particular, $A^\mu(x)$ is real valued.

With Eq. (9) at hand, we may change variables from $\vec{\lambda}$ to $\vec{p}$ in Eq. (12). Note that this is just a linear shift of variables, so that the Jacobian is trivial. The exponentials will now contain a $\vec{p}$-independent piece, which can be pulled out of the integral:

$$A^\mu(x) = \mathcal{A}^\mu(x)\exp(-ik\cdot x) + \mathcal{A}^{\mu *}(x)\exp(+ik\cdot x)\;, \tag{13}$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^\mu(x) \equiv \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3}\;\left[\xi^\mu_1(\vec{p}\,)\exp(-ip_+\cdot x) + \xi^{\mu *}_2(\vec{p}\,)\exp(ip_+\cdot x)\right]\,. \tag{14}$$

In this expression, the new polarization vectors $\xi^\mu_a(\vec{p}\,)$ are given in terms of the old polarization vectors $\epsilon^\mu_a(\vec{\lambda})$ simply by a shift in the argument $\xi^\mu_a(\vec{p}\,) = \epsilon^\mu_a(\vec{p} - (-1)^a\vec{k})$.

The Definition (14) reveals that the fields $\mathcal{A}^\mu(x)$ are superpositions of plane waves with Lorentz-symmetric dispersion relation $(p_\pm)^2 = 0$. This fact implies that $\Box\mathcal{A}^\mu(x) = 0$. Note that this equation resembles the conventional Maxwell equations in Lorentz gauge. As advertised above, this field is obtained from the original solution A^μ by first splitting off all exponentials with labels $(+,\, a = 1)$ or $(-,\, a = 2)$ and then removing their common $\exp(-ik\cdot x)$ factor. An analogous argument holds for $\mathcal{A}^{\mu *}(x)$.

The complex-valued $\mathcal{A}^\mu(x)$ field gives rise to a real-valued vector field $\underline{A}^\mu(x)$ in a natural way:

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{A}^\mu(x) &= \mathcal{A}^\mu(x) + \mathcal{A}^{\mu *}(x)\\ &= \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{a=1,2} \left[\xi_a^\mu(\vec{p}) \exp(-ip_+\cdot x) + \xi_a^{\mu *}(\vec{p}) \exp(ip_+\cdot x)\right] .\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

This field also obeys an equation that is consistent with the conventional Maxwell theory in Lorentz gauge:

$$\Box\underline{A}^\mu(x) = 0\,. \tag{16}$$

We therefore see that a given solution $A^\mu(x)$ of the Chern–Simons modified electrodynamics leads to a field $\underline{A}^\mu(x)$ that obeys a Klein–Gordon-type equation in each component, so that at least the plane-wave exponentials are Lorentz symmetric.

Equation (16) essentially governs the spacetime dependence of the redefined field $\underline{A}^\mu(x)$ via the plane-wave exponentials, but it leaves undetermined the polarizations vectors. This is consistent with the gauge invariance of the Chern–Simons model: we have not yet selected a gauge for A^μ, but the field redefinition gives a field $\underline{A}^\mu$ satisfying Eq. (16), which looks gauge fixed (Lorentz gauge). This is, of course, not the case precisely because of the above issue that the polarizations vectors are still undetermined. For $\underline{A}^\mu$ to obey the usual Maxwell equations in Lorentz gauge, we not only need Eq. (16), but also the additional Lorentz condition $\partial_\mu\underline{A}^\mu = 0$. This condition constrains the polarization vectors $\xi_a^\mu(\vec{p})$ to be transverse.

Suppose we select Lorentz gauge in the Chern–Simons model $\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0$. Then, the question arises as to whether our field redefinition leaves unchanged this gauge condition. This is, in fact, not the case. We obtain

$$\partial_\mu A^\mu = 0 \quad\to\quad \partial_\mu\underline{A}^\mu = -2\,\mathrm{Im}\,(k\cdot\mathcal{A}) \tag{17}$$

for the redefined condition. Since $\mathrm{Im}\,(\mathcal{A}^\mu)$ cannot be freely chosen (it is determined by $\mathrm{Re}\,(\mathcal{A}^\mu)$ to yield plane-wave exponentials), the redefined field $\underline{A}^\mu$ fails to obey the Lorentz condition. Let us instead select the gauge

$$\partial_\mu A^\mu(x) = 2\,\mathrm{Im}\left[\,k\cdot\mathcal{A}(x)\,\exp(-ik\cdot x)\,\right] \tag{18}$$

for the solution of the Chern–Simons model. Substituting Eq. (13) on the left-hand side of Eq. (18) then gives $\mathrm{Re}\left[\,\exp(-ik\cdot x)\,\partial\cdot\mathcal{A}(x)\,\right] = 0$. Using the plane-wave expansion of $\mathcal{A}^\mu(x)$, one can verify‡ that this essentially implies $\partial\cdot\mathcal{A}(x) = \partial\cdot\mathcal{A}^*(x) = 0$, and therefore

$$\partial_\mu\underline{A}^\mu(x) = 0\,. \tag{19}$$

---

‡ We exclude special cases, such as solutions containing a single plane wave with $p^\mu = \pm k^\mu$ and specially chosen phases or solutions of two plane waves with $p^\mu = 0$ and specially chosen phases.

This result establishes that with a carefully selected gauge for solutions A^μ in the Lorentz- and CPT-breaking Chern–Simons model, the field redefinition discussed above yields a solution $\underline{A}^\mu$ of conventional electrodynamics in Lorentz gauge. It follows that such a mapping, defined on-shell, removes Lorentz and CPT violation from the Chern–Simons model.

5. Compact expression for field redefinition

In the previous section, we have discussed the possibility of removing a lightlike Lorentz- and CPT-violating k^μ coefficient from Chern–Simons electrodynamics. We have illustrated why and how this can be achieved. The basic idea has been the following. The first step is to decompose an arbitrary solution A^μ of the Chern–Simons model into two pieces, one containing the plane waves with dispersion relation shifted by $+k^\mu$ and the other containing those with the opposite shift $-k^\mu$. In the second step, the Lorentz-violating shift is undone with a simple multiplicative field redefinition involving $\exp(+ik\cdot x)$ in one of these pieces and $\exp(-ik\cdot x)$ in the other.

In this section, we set out to find a more compact form for such an on-shell mapping from the set of solutions in the Chern–Simons model to the set of solutions in conventional electrodynamics. Clearly, the more challenging step in the field redefinition is the first one that decomposes a given solution A^μ according shift direction in k^μ and yields both $\mathcal{A}^\mu$ and $\mathcal{A}^{\mu *}$. In principle, this task can be performed with Fourier methods that simply project out the desired pieces. This section gives closed-form expressions for suitable projectors.

We begin by characterizing the set of solutions A^μ to Eq. (3) that we take as the domain for our field-redefinition mapping. As in the previous section, we fix k^μ to be lightlike $k^\mu k_\mu = 0$, and we consider all well-behaved fields of the form displayed in Eq. (12). Note that all plane-wave momenta in the exponentials satisfy the dispersion relation (7). In particular, any field A^μ obeying Eq. (12) therefore also satisfies

$$\left[\Box^2 + 4(k\cdot\partial)^2\right] A^\mu(x) = 0\,. \tag{20}$$

We remark that all other solutions to Eq. (3) can differ from Eq. (12) only by a total derivative, a quantity that leaves unaffected the physics. Note that we are not committing ourselves to a definite gauge because of the remaining freedom in the choice of polarization vectors in Eq. (12).

Consider the operators P_+ and P_- defined by

$$P_\pm \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(1 \pm 2i\,\frac{k\cdot\partial}{\Box}\right)\,. \tag{21}$$

When these operators act on our set of solution A^μ characterized above, we find the following: the operators are complete in the sense that $P_+ + P_- = 1$, they are orthogonal in the sense $P_\pm P_\mp = 0$, and they are idempotent $P_\pm^2 = P_\pm$. To arrive at these results, we have employed Eq. (20). It is apparent that P_+ and P_- are operators that project onto two disjoint subsets of solutions. Moreover, the union of these subsets is equal to our full set of solutions.

When acting on plane-wave exponentials, the projectors yield

$$\begin{aligned} P_+ \,\exp(\pm i\lambda^+_a\!\cdot\! x) &= \frac{1}{2}\,[1 \pm (-1)^a]\exp(\pm i\lambda^+_a\!\cdot\! x)\,,\\ P_- \,\exp(\pm i\lambda^+_a\!\cdot\! x) &= \frac{1}{2}\,[1 \mp (-1)^a]\exp(\pm i\lambda^+_a\!\cdot\! x)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Employing these relations, one can then show that

$$\begin{aligned} P_+\,A^\mu(x) &= \mathcal{A}^\mu(x)\,,\\ P_-\,A^\mu(x) &= \mathcal{A}^{\mu *}(x)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

With the above results at hand, we are now in the position to give a more concise form of our field-redefinition mapping:

$$\underline{A}^\mu(x) = \exp(-ik\!\cdot\! x)\,P_+\,A^\mu(x) + \exp(+ik\!\cdot\! x)\,P_-\,A^\mu(x)\,. \tag{24}$$

We mention that with the field redefinition (24) and the equations of motion (20) one can verify Eq. (16) directly without using plane-wave expansions. We also remark that a similar field redefinition exists for the closely related Lorentz- and CPT-violating b^μ parameter for SME fermion [12].

6. Summary and outlook

Lorentz and CPT symmetry are deeply ingrained in the presently accepted laws of physics. However, there are various candidate underlying theories that could lead to the breakdown of these spacetime symmetries. The sensitivity of current or near-future experiments testing these ideas would allow the detection of Planck-suppressed effects. It follows that Lorentz and CPT tests offer a promising avenue for quantum-gravity phenomenology.

The leading-order Lorentz- and CPT-breaking effects that would arise from Lorentz-symmetry violations in approaches to fundamental physics are described by the SME. At the level of effective quantum field theory, the SME is the most general dynamical framework for Lorentz and CPT breakdown compatible with the fundamental principles of unitarity and coordinate independence. The SME incorporates the usual Standard Model of particle physics and General Relativity as limiting cases. Experimental investigations are therefore best performed within the SME.

The electrodynamics sector of the SME contains a Chern–Simons-type operator contracted with a Lorentz- and CPT-violating four-vector coupling k^μ. Such a coupling can, for example, arise through a nontrivial spacetime topology or in certain cosmological supergravity models as a result of varying scalar fields. If k^μ is lightlike, the free solutions of this model can be mapped to the solutions of conventional Maxwell electrodynamics. The specific form of this field redefinition is determined by Eq. (24). This mapping is nonlocal, and it applies on-shell.

There are still a few open questions regarding this field redefinition that need to be addressed in the future. It is, for instance, interesting to determine whether this mapping is one-to-one and onto. If so, there would be a direct correspondence between the Lorentz- and CPT-violating Chern–Simons model and ordinary Lorentz- and CPT-symmetric electrodynamics. Certain known results in the conventional Maxwell model, could then simply be translated to the more complex Chern–Simons model via the field-redefinition map. Other open issues concern the question as to whether such types of field redefinitions can also be found for timelike and spacelike k^μ or for interacting models. An additional important aspect we have left largely unaddressed is gauge symmetry. Although we have discussed the example of Lorentz gauge, a more detailed analysis of how gauge conditions are affected by the mapping could yield valuable insight into the mathematical structure of the Chern–Simons model and the field redefinition.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under cooperative research agreement No. DE-FG02-05ER41360 and by the European Commission under Grant No. MOIF-CT-2005-008687.

References

[1] See, e.g., V.A. Kostelecký and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 683 (1989); V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Nucl. Phys. B **359**, 545 (1991); B. Altschul and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Lett. B **628**, 106 (2005).

[2] See, e.g., S.M. Carroll *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 141601 (2001); Z. Guralnik *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **517**, 450 (2001); C.E. Carlson *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **518**, 201 (2001); A. Anisimov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 085032 (2002).

[3] V.A. Kostelecký *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 123511 (2003); R. Jackiw and S.-Y. Pi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 104012 (2003); O. Bertolami *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 083513 (2004); N. Arkani-Hamed *et al.*, JHEP **0507**, 029 (2005).

[4] J. Alfaro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 124006 (2002); D. Sudarsky *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 231301 (2002); G. Amelino-Camelia, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **17**, 899 (2002); R.C. Myers and M. Pospelov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 211601 (2003); N.E. Mavromatos, Lect. Notes Phys. **669**, 245 (2005).

[5] F.R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. B **578**, 277 (2000); F.R. Klinkhamer and J. Schimmel, Nucl. Phys. B **639**, 241 (2002).

[6] C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, arXiv:hep-ph/0211106.

[7] J.D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 043508 (2003).

[8] C.P. Burgess *et al.*, JHEP **0203**, 043 (2002); A.R. Frey, JHEP **0304**, 012 (2003); J. Cline and L. Valcárcel, JHEP **0403**, 032 (2004).

[9] D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 6760 (1997); Phys. Rev. D **58**, 116002 (1998); V.A. Kostelecký and R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 065008 (2001).

[10] V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 105009 (2004); R. Bluhm and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 065008 (2005).

[11] See, e.g., R. Jackiw and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3572 (1999); V.A. Kostelecký *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 056006 (2002); R. Lehnert, Ph.D. Thesis, UMI-30-54449 (2002). Phys. Rev. D **68**, 085003 (2003); J. Math. Phys. **45**, 3399 (2004); V.A. Kostelecký and R. Potting, Gen.

Rel. Grav. **37**, 1675 (2005); B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 045004 (2006); J. Phys. A **39**, 13757 (2006).

[12] R. Lehnert, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 125001 (2006).

[13] A.J. Hariton and R. Lehnert, Phys. Lett. A **367**, 11 (2007).

[14] See, e.g., V.A. Kostelecký, ed., *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry III*, World Scientific, Singapore, 2005; D. Mattingly, Living Rev. Rel. **8**, 5 (2005).

[15] See, e.g., J. Lipa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 060403 (2003); P.L. Stanwix *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 081101 (2006); M.E. Tobar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 025004 (2005); M. Hohensee *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 049902 (2007); J.P. Cotter and B. Varcoe, physics/0603111; H. Müller *et al.*, arXiv:0706.2031.

[16] See, e.g., R. Lehnert and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 110402 (2004); Phys. Rev. D **70**, 125010 (2004); C. Kaufhold and F.R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. B **734**, 1 (2006); B. Altschul, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 041603 (2007).

[17] See, e.g., T. Katori and R. Tayloe, in Ref. [14]; LSND Collaboration, L.B. Auerbach *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 076004 (2005); V.A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 016005 (2004); V. Barger *et al.*, arXiv:0706.1085 [hep-ph].

[18] See, e.g., H. Dehmelt *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4694 (1999); G. Gabrielse *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 3198 (1999); L.-S. Hou, W.-T. Ni, and Y.-C.M. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 201101 (2003); H. Müller, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 045004 (2005).

[19] See, e.g., D.F. Phillips *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 111101(R) (2001); P. Wolf *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 060801 (2006); O. Bertolami *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **395**, 178 (1997).

[20] See, e.g., BELLE Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3228 (2001); BaBar Collaboration, B. Aubert *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 181801 (2004); arXiv:hep-ex/0607103; FOCUS Collaboration, J.M. Link *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **556**, 7 (2003).

[21] V.W. Hughes *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 111804 (2001); R. Bluhm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1098 (2000).

[22] M.S. Berger and V.A. Kostelecký, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 091701(R) (2002); H. Belich *et al.*, Phys. Lett. A **370**, 126 (2007); M.S. Berger, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 115005 (2003).

[23] V.A. Kostelecký and M. Mewes, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 056005 (2002).

[24] S. Coleman and S.L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116008 (1999).

[25] S.M. Carroll *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1231 (1990).

[26] C. Adam and F.R. Klinkhamer, Nucl. Phys. B **607**, 247 (2001).